

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-12 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 11 are amended. Support for the amended feature recited in claims 1 and 11 can be found in paragraph [0029], for example. No new matter has been added.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies shown to Applicant's representative by Examiners Mruk and Meier in the June 21, 2006 personal interview. Applicant's separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

The Amendment filed September 16, 2005 included formal replacement sheets for Figs. 1-9. Applicant respectfully requests in writing that the drawings filed on September 16, 2005 are accepted.

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 4,703,333 to Hubbard in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,768, 266 to DeYoung. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed during the personal interview, Hubbard and DeYoung fail to disclose or suggest an ink-jet head with a sealing member on a lateral side of the ink-jet head at a location where a power supply member is drawn out, as recited in claims 1 and 11.

Hubbard discloses electrical cables 98 (Figs. 8 and 9) and DeYoung discloses a lead 32 located between an epoxy 28 and an elastomeric compound 34 (Fig. 6). However, neither the epoxy 28 nor the elastomeric compound 34 (identified on page 6 of the Office Action as corresponding to the sealing member) is on a lateral side of an ink-jet head at a location where a power supply member is drawn out, as recited in claims 1 and 11.

Neither Hubbard nor DeYoung, alone or in any permissible combination disclose or suggest a protrusion provided in at least either of the surface of the spaced portion facing the passage portion and the surface of the passage portion facing the spaced portion, as recited in claim 1.

Neither Hubbard nor DeYoung, alone or in permissible combination disclose or suggest a protrusion that is provided in an area of the spaced surface of the reservoir unit, the area is opposite to the bonded surface with respect to an area facing the actuator unit, and the power supply member is in abutment with both of the protrusion and the passage unit, as recited in claim 11.

The protrusion of Hubbard (i.e., recessed shelf member 102; Fig. 9 of Hubbard) does not correspond to the protrusion as recited in claims 1 and 11. As clearly shown in Figs. 7-9 of Hubbard, the cable 98 is placed on the recessed shelf member 102 and a cover plate 108 covers the manifold 92 without contacting the cable 98. As Hubbard describes, the manifold 92 is provided with an integral recessed shelf member 102 adapted to support the cable 98 (col. 7, lines 26-28).

Because the recessed shelf member 102 is recessed and configured to support the cable 98 so that the cover 108 can cover the window 94 and cable 98, the recessed shelf member 102 does not protrude (see col. 7, lines 35-39; Figs. 7-9 of Hubbard). Thus, Hubbard does not disclose a protrusion provided in at least either of a surface of the space portion facing the spaced portion and the surface of the passage portion facing the spaced portion, as recited in claim 1.

Further, Hubbard does not disclose or suggest that a protrusion is provided in an area of the spaced surface (i.e., fill tubes 104; Fig. 10 of Hubbard) of the reservoir unit, the area is opposite to the bonded surface with respect to an area facing the actuator, as recited in claim 11. As discussed above, the recessed shelf member 102 of Hubbard is an integral part of the manifold 92 and supports the electric cable 98. The recessed shelf member 102 does not face the transducers 96 because of the opening in the manifold 92 of Hubbard (see Fig. 9 of Hubbard). Also, the fill tubes 104 of Hubbard are disposed on opposite sides of the

recessed shelf member 102. Thus, the recessed shelf member 102 is provided between the fill tubes 104 and is not provided in an area of the fill tubes 104.

DeYoung fails to overcome deficiencies of Hubbard as applied to claims 1 and 11.

Because neither Hubbard nor DeYoung, alone or in permissible combination disclose, suggest or teach the features as recited in claims 1 and 11, the alleged permissible combination of Hubbard and DeYoung cannot possibly render obvious the subject matter of claims 2-10, which depend from claim 1, and the subject matter of claim 12, which depends from claim 11, for the reasons discussed with respect to claims 1 and 11 and for the additional features recited therein. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-12 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Scott M. Schulte  
Registration No. 44,325

JAO:SMS/tbm

Attachment:  
Request for Continued Examination

Date: July 20, 2006

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p><b>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION</b> Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
---